

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA #: AZ-420-2005-027

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum titled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy” transmitting this worksheet and the “Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet” located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case**
File No.

Proposed Action Title/Type: Native Fish Population Augmentation

Location of Proposed Action: Empire Gulch downstream of the Field Station

Description of the Proposed Action: Allow the Arizona Game and Fish Department and US Fish and Wildlife Service to augment the Gila topminnow and longfin dace population with fish collected from Cienega Creek through 2010. They will follow the same procedures and stocking numbers in the EA# AZ-060-2001-0056 and Biological Opinion 2-21-02-F-014. The BLM, Tucson Field Office, in coordination with Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department), propose to augment a population of Gila topminnow and a population of longfin dace in Empire Spring located in the upper portion of Empire Gulch, a tributary to Cienega Creek, which contains the source populations for the action. The project area is located within the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area (NCA) north of Sonoita, Pima County, Arizona. The project area is located just to the northeast of the Empire Ranch complex (T19S, R17E, Section 17 NW1/4 - see map 1). The project proposal consists of collecting Gila topminnow and longfin dace from Cienega Creek and releasing them into the perennial, upper portion of Empire Gulch Through 2010.

Fish will come from Cienega Creek near it’s confluence with Mattie Canyon (see map 2) approximately 10 miles away from upper Empire Gulch. The Arizona Game and Fish Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be responsible for collecting and moving native fish with the assistance of the BLM.

Applicant (if any): Arizona Game and Fish Department and US Fish and Wildlife Service

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan Date Approved July, 2003
LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____
Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: Fish and Wildlife management Action No. 9-f (WF17, p 35). Evaluate and stock 3 or more reintroductions within the basin with Gila topminnow in cooperation with the AGFD and USFWS.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan, approved July, 2003; EA# AZ-060-2001-0056 and RD dated September 17, 2001

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

Biological and Conference Opinion dated October 19, 2001. Effects of the proposed Gila topminnow reestablishment in Empire Gulch in Pima County, Arizona.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The action is the same only the time period has been extended from 2003 to 2010 and the AGFD and USFWS will determine numbers to be stocked.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The environmental analysis and biological evaluation are still valid as no new issues have surfaced concerning multiple use or effects to endangered species.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The management situation has not changed since the original EA was signed in 2001. A new ROD (2003) has been signed since the the EA was completed and RD signed. However, the EA/RD from 2001 and the BE for formal consultation with the USFWS are consistent with the Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and ROD.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: There is no need to change the methodology or approach since management situation has not changed since 2001.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The direct and indirect impacts are similar to those identified in the proposed action for the EA written in 2001. Information about the spread of a frog disease called Chytrid has become an issue that can be mitigated.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The cumulative negative impacts to the longfin dace and Gila topminnow are very low as both species reproduce prolifically in Cienega Creek. The capture and transplant of a few thousand fish over 5 a five year period will not have a lasting impact on either population in Cienega Creek. The addition of more fish to Empire Gulch will not have a negative cumulative impact on the Chiricahua leopard frog population. These three species coexist with no documented negative interactions. A positive cumulative impact occurs

when multiple sites on BLM lands are supporting self-sustaining populations of native fish. The end point of these cumulative effects is delisting or downlisting of the Gila topminnow.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership and others were involved in the planning for the action in 2001. The augmentation of fish in Empire Gulch does not change the issue(s) that the public commented. The AGFD and USFWS were fully involved in 2001 and have come to BLM with a request to extend the time period for stocking fish to 2010 due to unfavorable conditions related to drought.

E. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

Biologists moving fish need to sterilize all equipment including their waters/boots in order to protect the frog population from Cytrid contamination (currently a standard operating procedure for all agencies).

CONCLUSION

- ☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

Cindy Alvarez, Acting Field Manager

Date

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation

measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks: Follow mitigation measures for frog disease prevention and Terms and Conditions in amendment to BO for the Project.

Cindy Alvarez, Acting Field Manager

Date